



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ficacy of a formula for solving the problems of mankind. They did not grasp the significance of historical continuity and evolution, and they failed to comprehend the real functions of the church and the state, exalting the individual and ignoring in large degree the social and institutional factors of life.

On the question whether New England transcendentalism was indigenous to America or an importation from Europe, the work before us takes a middle position. From one point of view it was part of a world-wide and spontaneous movement at the end of the eighteenth century in the direction of other than intellectualistic standards and methods of truth. In this respect it compares with Coleridge's exaltation of reason above understanding (following the Kantians), Shelley's mysticism, Carlyle's gospel of work, Wordsworth's nature-worship, and so on. But the author holds that the original stimulus to the strictly metaphysical part of New England transcendentalism came largely, though not exclusively, from Germany, England being foremost, and France next in bringing this thought to America. Coleridge was the most important of English interpreters of German thought and Cousin, Mme. De Stael, and Jouffroy, of French.

The style in which the book is written will probably be vigorous and pleasing to the majority of readers. A good bibliography and index conclude the book.

G. A. TAWNEY.

University of Cincinnati.

ENGLISH LITERATURE: ITS HISTORY AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE IN THE LIFE OF THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD. A Text-Book for Schools. By William J. Long, Ph.D. (Heidelberg). Boston. Ginn & Company. 1909. 8vo, pp. xv, 582. Price, \$1.35.

The number of school histories of English literature has been considerably increased in the last few years. The latest addition to the list is the work of a clergyman and writer well known in other lines but, so far as we know, without special experience in the teaching of this subject. He seems, however, to have made conscientious preparation for the work of writing this book.

The volume is built on fairly generous lines. It contains about 150 pages more than Moody and Lovett's *History of English Literature* (1902) and about 100 pages more than Simonds's book of the same title (1902). It is only slightly heavier than the former, and a somewhat shapelier vol-

ume than that of Simonds, which is printed on thicker paper. In the matter of illustrations, it may be added that while Moody and Lovett's book contains none, and Simonds's has 13, Long's has 53, of which five or six are full-page, and of which all are clear and distinctly creditable to the book. The frontispiece is a handsome reproduction in eleven colors of the group of Canterbury pilgrims from Ms. Royal 18 D ii in the British Museum. Professor Phelps's Literary Map of England (1899), in a revised form, is inserted. For the text three kinds of type are employed: small pica for the description and criticism of works and periods, long primer for the historical summaries and biographical sketches, and brevier for the bibliographical notes and review questions. Typographically the volume reflects great credit on all who have helped to produce it.¹

The writer of a school text-book on literary history must consider at least four points: interest, accuracy, proportion, and comprehensiveness. In respect to the first of these Mr. Long succeeds well. He writes clearly, in the main, and easily; he is free from cant and gush, yet he is properly enthusiastic. In a short introduction (nine pages) he has rightly insisted upon the importance of literature as embodying national and popular ideals; and his later chapters are generally consistent with this view. His estimates are rarely of the hackneyed or merely conventional type, and show a well developed sense of literary values.

Likewise in the matter of accuracy, so far as we have tested Mr. Long's statements we have found them to be generally correct. A vast number of facts, dates, and titles are presented; yet the percentage of errors is small. Some details under this head are noted below.

Of the ideal proportions of a book of this kind every writer and critic will have his own notion. Mr. Long's notion may be gathered from a few random illustrations. He devotes three pages to Marlowe, eighteen and one-half to Shakespeare, five and one-half to Ben Jonson, three and one-half to Beaumont and Fletcher, Webster, Middleton, Thomas Heywood, Dekker, Massinger, Ford, Shirley; eight to Bacon, eight to Bunyan, three to Evelyn and Pepys; sixteen and one-half to Milton,

¹ We have noted the following misprints: P. 49, l. 3 f.b., read: 'Advocates'. P. 118, l. 1 f.b., read: 'century'. P. 120, l. 11, read: 'out rode'; l. 13, read: 'And all about'; ll. 15, 20, read: 'merrily'. P. 181, l. 14, read: 'Northup'. P. 192, l. 17, transfer 'and' to the beginning of the next line. P. 360, l. 17, delete the parenthesis. P. 562, l. 9 f.b., for Meyer's read: Myers's. P. 570, l. 4 f.b., read: 'Litteraria'.

seven to Dryden, two to Butler, three and one-half to Gray, six to Goldsmith, nine and one-half to Dickens, eight to Thackeray, eight to George Eliot. The minor Victorian poets, Mrs. Browning, Rossetti, Morris, and Swinburne get, we think, rather too little space (together five pages); and surely the poetry of Clough (p. 486) should receive more than a mere mention. Emily Brontë (p. 514) is, relatively to her sister Charlotte, probably worth more than a note of five lines. It is perhaps a question if Chapter V, The Revival of Learning (only ten pages), has an excuse for separate existence. These last, however, are only minor criticisms; in the main, Mr. Long's sense of proportion will commend itself to most of his readers.

To come to our fourth point, by comprehensiveness we do not mean completeness—an impossible ideal; we mean that a writer of a history like this is not at liberty to select a few great names and ignore all the lesser ones. Some consideration of minor writers is needed as a background. Mr. Long's generous attention to minor writers may be called one of the distinctive and commendable features of his book. In the Victorian era, for example, he finds space for mention of J. A. Symonds, Sir Leslie Stephen, Huxley, Tyndall, and Wallace; in the earlier chapters he mentions men like Raleigh, North, Hakluyt, Percy, and William Hazlitt, whom others have often omitted. It is this quality of comprehensiveness which renders this book superior for school use, in our estimation, to works like Hinchman and Gummere's *Lives of Great English Writers*, in its way a thoroughly good book.

We now pass to some more minute criticisms:

P. 17, l. 8 f.b. Was *Beowulf* undoubtedly written on English soil? Assuredly its present form was produced on English soil, but the earlier form probably goes back to Continental times. See B. Symons in Paul's *Grundriss*² iii. 644-54.

P. 31, l. 10. It may be convenient to exclude Bede, but it is certainly illogical. Bede was none the less an Englishman for the accident that he, like other scholars of the day, wrote in Latin, and his *Ecclesiastical History* is just as much a product of English genius as if it had been originally written in English.

P. 52, l. 10. Is it strictly accurate to say that Tennyson's work was "founded on" Geoffrey? A long period of development intervened between Geoffrey and Malory, from whom Tennyson got most of his Arthurian stories.

P. 57, note 1. It may be doubted whether Tennyson "made a mistake" in treating Gawayne as he did. He only followed the well known tradition by which Gawayne was degraded from his former lofty character; and the poet, it must be remembered,

had his own artistic purpose to serve. He was not merely translating; he was creating. Gawayne in Tennyson forms a kind of link between Lancelot and Tristram.

P. 69, l. 20. There should, we think, be a more positive injunction to pronounce the *-e* at the end of a Chaucerian line.

P. 73, l. 7. Is not this misleading? Do we know definitely that Chaucer translated the whole of *Le Roman de la Rose*?

P. 77, l. 11. Probably the author does not sufficiently take into account the ballad literature, which certainly does not refer to a heroic age.

P. 78, l. 14 f.b. We should hesitate to speak of *The Knight's Tale* as dramatically powerful. It can hardly be denied that there is a good deal of lingering in true medieval fashion over certain parts of the tale.

P. 82, l. 4. "The common people cherished this easily memorized form of Saxon poetry." Is not this misleading with reference to the number of readers and interested hearers of that day? It suggests too strongly the conditions of modern times.

P. 85, l. 15. "Copied manuscripts." The adjective is unnecessary, since practically all medieval mss. were copied, not original.

P. 86, l. 25. Gower certainly deserves a large-type notice.

P. 95, l. 3. Why say "both together?" They did not collaborate. L. 15. Surely Malory should precede Wyatt and Surrey. Nothing is gained by the present order.

P. 96, l. 5. Which one of the four poets wrote a poem called "The Death of Tristram"? Tennyson, Arnold, and Swinburne wrote on Tristram's death, but of these only Tennyson follows Malory's conclusion of the Tristram story. See Malory xx. 6.

P. 109. We do not see what is gained by putting *The Shepherd's Calendar* after *The Faerie Queene*.

P. 110, l. 13. "Softly closes the book in gentle weariness." This is tame beyond endurance. If the author consciously tried to drop into a Spenserian trick, he more than succeeded.

P. 113, l. 17. A much larger number of poets had a hand in *The Mirror for Magistrates*.

P. 114, l. 8. *Euphues* at this point is not an intelligible reference; a cross-reference to p. 130, n. 2 should be added. L. 16. Chapman, by Mr. Long's own admission, belongs rather with the dramatists on page 163.

P. 118, l. 15. Did the annual presentation of the miracle plays usually or even rarely occupy "a week or more"? Even at Chester they were spread over only three days; cf. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage* ii. 138. Nor did they always begin on Corpus Christi Day.

P. 119, l. 4. The author here gives the impression that the Devil occurs in every play. He does occur in every cycle, of course.

P. 120, l. 11 f.b. The source of these songs, apparently from the Coventry Pageant of the Shearmen and Tailors, might well be noted; cf. Manly, *Specimens of the Pre-Shakspearean Drama* i. 151-2. L. 9 f.b. "The audience insisting." Was it insistence on the part of the audience or respect for the traditional Bible stories which kept the original form of these folk-dramas on the stage?

P. 123, l. 13. That the interludes "add nothing to our literature" is too sweeping a statement.

P. 151, l. 18. This is an inadequate definition of tragedy. When characters are involved in desperate circumstances, what results is not necessarily a tragedy. It depends on whether the desperate circumstances result from the action of the persons involved. Modern tragedy, that is, must be regarded as having its roots in character.

P. 153, l. 12. While we incline to agree with Mr. Long, it is only fair to point out that in the view of some intelligent critics the sonnets of Shakespeare are quite as impersonal as his plays. And why should the reader avoid (l. 13 f.b.) such or any other classifications?

P. 154, l. 8 f.b. That Shakespeare and the Bible will provide one who merely reads them with a style is open to doubt.

P. 182, l. 24. Brooke's *Shakespeare Apocrypha* has really no place here.

P. 182, l. 6 f.b. Macaulay on Bacon ought not to be recommended to any but mature students—for whom it is worthless.

P. 214, l. 16. This, after the very correct strictures already passed on *Paradise Lost*, is too high praise. Magnificent passages *Paradise Lost* surely has; but structurally it has been too highly rated; even Milton's mighty genius was unequal to the task of handling a theme so full of impossibilities.

P. 227, l. 9. "Currantoes" needs explanation.

P. 265, l. 20. This is rather hard on Voltaire; in fact it is totally misleading and uncalled for. It is time some one attempted to do for Voltaire what he did for Calas, and what Spedding tried to do for Bacon.

P. 282, l. 2 f.b. Addison's clearness is here, as it has often been, exaggerated.

P. 297, l. 3 f.b. Would not "the most eloquent orator whom" be better than "orator which"?

P. 323, l. 6 f.b. Burns's "personal habits." Strictly speaking, it was despair over the immediate desperate situation in

which he found himself with reference to Jean Armour and her irate father that induced him to try to emigrate.

P. 324, l. 19. Burns did not buy the farm of Ellisland; he merely leased it.

P. 327. The significance of the picture of "The Auld Brig" of Ayr should be indicated.

P. 414, l. 8. "After wandering," etc., is a poor sentence.

P. 473, l. 17. Volumes iii and iv of *The Ring and the Book* were published in 1869.

P. 532, l. 9 f.b. "One of the most illuminating criticisms of Burns that *has* appeared in our language." It is time this thoroughly illogical construction disappeared from good writing. We are perfectly well aware of how it grew up and of how good writers sometimes slip into using it; yet it is bad present-day English nevertheless.

P. 536, l. 13 f.b. "Carlyle often violates the rules of grammar." This is somewhat misleading and unjust to Carlyle. In the commonly accepted sense of the term, Carlyle is rarely if ever ungrammatical.

P. 562, l. 3 f.b. Long omits Alexander's *Introduction to Browning*, one of the best of such books.

P. 563, l. 3 f.b. On Craig's *Making of Carlyle*, see the present writer's review in *The Dial* xlvii. 283-4; also *The Nation* lxxxviii. 360.

P. 565, l. 2. Add Woodberry's *Swinburne*, in the *Contemporary Men of Letters* Series.

P. 570, l. 6 f.b. Add Sir Leslie Stephen's *Studies of a Biographer*.

The index is fairly full, but far from complete.

To conclude, we must congratulate Mr. Long on having produced an eminently practical and stimulating book. It will serve as a useful guide for study and reference among high-school pupils, and its compressed form does not prevent it from being a good book for the general reader.

C.S.N.